SCREENING SITE INVESTIGATION

REDACTED

CHEMICAL LEAMAN TANK LINES, INC.
JONESBORO, GEORGIA
GAD046893764

Gilda A. Knowles
Environmental Specialist
Georgia Environmental Protection Division
June 1988

Reviewed by: Marlin A. Gottschalk Date: 6-30-88

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHEMICAL LEAMAN TANK LINES, INC.

SCREENING SITE INVESTIGATION REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. is located at 1251 Battle Creek Road (P. O. Box 7) in Jonesboro, Clayton County, Georgia 30236. The coordinates are latitude 33° 33' 10.0" N and longitude 084° 21' 23.0" W.

The Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. began its operations in 1971 and is owned by Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. of Lionville, Pennsylvania 19353. This facility is a Common Carrier transporting chemical commodities in bulk quantities. Tanker trucks which transport a wide variety of chemical products, some of which are hazardous, are rinsed-out with a caustic solution (NaOH) and hot water after each delivery. The rinsate is collected in six in-ground concrete basins for settling. The liquid portion of the tank contents is discharged to the local Publically-Owned Treatment Works (POTW) and the bottom sludge is periodically collected in drums and shipped to a waste disposal facility. The waste quantity is unknown. Sludge samples analyzed on June 10, 1976 contained chromium, zinc, lead, and iron. The samples were analyzed by Commonwealth Laboratory of Greenville, South Carolina. Currently, the bottom sludge is collected by Barton Environmental Services of Morrow, Georgia. The Clayton County Water Authority conducts tests on the discharge to the sewer system on a regular basis. Chemical Leaman tests the final rinsate twice a week and the pH is checked daily. The facility is classified as a small quantity generator under RCRA.

The site is located in the Southern Piedmont Land Resource Area. Drainage for the area is provided principally by the Flint River, the South River, and tributaries to these rivers. The Flint River is the boundary separating Clayton and Fayette Counties. The landscape consists of ridgetops and hill sides that are dissected by numerous drainageways. The area is generally characterized by broad, gently sloping and strongly sloping ridgetops in the western part and by steep hillsides below narrow ridgetops in the east. Narrow to wide nearly-level flood plains are throughout the area, but are commonly adjacent to steep hillsides. The soils in the area of the site are a combination of Pacolet sandy loam (6 - 10% slopes) and Urban Lands. The Pacolet sandy loam is a deep, well-drained, strongly sloping soil on narrow ridgetops and short hillsides of the Piedmont Upland. Slopes are irregular and convex. Permeability is moderate and the available water capacity is medium. Urban Land has soil that has been modified. Cuts are deep inplaces and expose weathered mica schist, granite or gneiss. Slopes are 2 to 25 percent.

Potential targets in the area are 39 households with wells within a 4-mile radius of the site. It is not known if these wells are being used.
This investigation was conducted because the site is located in a heavily populated and industrialized area. Surface runoff from the site enters Jester Creek about 1,000 feet to the west. There are older homes that may use shallow wells in the area for drinking water purposes. The preliminary HRS scoring for the site is less than 25.0. A greater score was not obtainable because there were no observed releases that could be attributed to the site and there were no wastes disposed of on-site. Since the HRS scoring is less than 25.00, Georgia EPD recommends that no further remedial action be planned for this site.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. started operations in 1971 and is still active. A wide variety of chemical commodities, some of which are hazardous, are transported by bulk. Tankers are rinsed out with a caustic solution and the final rinsate is discharged to several on-site settling basins. This wastewater is discharged to the county sewer system. The bottom sludge is handled by Barton Environmental Services of Morrow, Georgia. An investigation of the facility was conducted because surface runoff from the site enters Jester Creek and older homes in the area may use shallow wells for drinking water.

2.0 SITE CHARACTERIZATION

The facility is owned by Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. of Lionville, Pennsylvania 30326. Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. withdrew its application for a Hazardous Waste Facility permit and is currently classified as a small quantity generator (Ref. 1). Tanker trucks that are cleaned at the facility are rinsed out with a caustic solution (NaOH) and hot water after each delivery. The final rinsate is collected in a cascading system of 6 concrete basins for settling. The liquid portion of the basins is discharged to the Clayton County sewer system. The Clayton County Water Authority conducts tests on these discharges on a regular basis. The bottom sludge is collected by Barton Environmental Services of Morrow, Georgia. The basins have holding capacities of 200 - 300 gallons.

Initial rinses are collected in 5-gallon containers and then placed into 55-gallon drums, labeled and then picked up for disposal (Ref. 2). Solid-Tek of Morrow, Georgia and Tri-State Steel Drum Co. of Graysville, Georgia handle and dispose of these hazardous wastes (Ref. 3). These same disposal practices have been employed since the facility began its operations in 1971 (Ref. 2). There are no records on file of any remedial actions at this site (Ref. 1).

The site covers an area of 7.4 acres and is enclosed by a fence. Due to its business operations, the site is continuously open. The rear of the site is bordered by Jester Creek and a heavily forested area. There are two buildings on-site. Drainage from rinse operations are directed to six in-ground concrete basins (Ref. 2). There are no on-site wells. The facility is supplied its water by Clayton County (Ref. 2). Wastes are not disposed of on-site. Waste types may range from latexes and resins to herbicides.

The land in the area is highly industrialized and heavily populated. The facility is one of several companies in an industrial park (Ref. 1, 2). North Jonesboro High School is located 1.25 miles south of the facility (Ref. 5). Kindergarten/day care centers were not observed in the area of the site. There are sensitive environments (5-acre wetlands) within the four-mile radius and where Jester Creek enters the Flint River (Ref. 5). There is little or no agricultural land located in the immediate vicinity of the site. Homes in the area are both single and multi-family residences, including apartment complexes.

Clayton County has long, hot summers because moist tropical air from the Gulf of Mexico persistently covers the area. Winters are cool and fairly short. The warm, moist climate promotes rapid weathering of hard rock. Consequently, in much of the area, the soils are three to six feet deep over a thick layer of loose, disintegrated, weathered rock, which blankets the hard bedrock underlying the County (Ref. 6). The average rainfall is approximately 48.0 inches per year. The mean annual lake evaporation is 42.0 inches. The net precipitation for the area is 6.0 inches. And the one-year 24-hour rainfall for the area is 3.0 inches (Ref. 6, 7).

Surface runoff from the site drains to the west into Jester Creek which is approximately 1,000 feet away. Jester Creek, in turn, enters the Flint River approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the site (Ref. 5).

There are no known surface intakes within 15.0 downstream miles of the site. However, the Flint River serves Clayton County as one of its drinking water sources (Ref. 8). This surface water is not used for irrigation purposes. Most of the surface waters in the area are used for fishing/recreation purposes (Ref. 6). There are no records on file concerning contaminated surface water.

The primary water resources for Clayton County are two surface water plants/basins, the Little Cotton Indian Creek in Henry County, and Shoal Creek and the Flint River in Clayton County (Ref. 8). Neither of these water supplies are affected by drainage from the Chemical Leaman Tank Lines site. However, there are also two drilled wells in the City of Jonesboro (290 and 400 feet deep) (Ref. 9). These wells are drawing from crystalline rock aquifers, which vary in depths because of the groundwater storage which occurs in unconsolidated materials and other joints and fractures (Ref. 10). Groundwater in the area is used for drinking water (Ref. 10). The population distribution within one-, two-, three- and four-mile radii is 1,780, 4,225, 7,687, and 12,186, respectively (Ref. 5). There were 39 wells observed within a four-mile radius of the site. The nearest well is located within less than 1.0 mile of the site (Ref. 5).

3.0 TARGET ANALYSIS

There are no potentially affected populations using surface water within 15.0 downstream miles of the site. There are 39 wells known to be within a 4.0-mile radius of the site. The equivalent population of the well count is 148. Air within the 4.0 mile radius was not monitored and full face respirators were not needed during sampling on- or off-site. The site is not easy accessible. The population within a one-mile radius of the site is 1,780.

3. 0 TARGET SUMMARY

Pathways	POTENTIALLY AFFECTED POPULATIONS
Surface Water (15 miles)	NONE - (There are no known populations that are potentially affected within 15 miles)
Groundwater (4 miles)	148 (39 wells x 3.8)
Air (4 miles)	NONE
On-Site Exposure (1 mile)	NONE 1 mile population = 1,780

The table above denotes populations that are potentially affected by the various pathways. Target populations are low in the area of the site.

4.0 FIELD INVESTIGATION

A total of two samples were collected by Georgia EPD on May 17, 1988 to identify possible releases from Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. A soil composite sample (S-1) was collected from several areas on-site and a soil background sample (S-2) off-site (Ref. 4). The soil composite sample was collected from around the drum storage area, tanker parking area, tanker washdown area and the concrete basins (Ref. 4). Samples on-site were collected from depths of 2 to 6 inches, because of gravel in these areas. The soil background sample was collected from a forested are 1.25 miles south of the site at a depth of 1.0 foot (Ref. 4). There were no duplicate samples taken and there were no other field measurements taken.

Surface water samples from Jester Creek were not collected because of four other industries located along the creek, making identification of the source of potential contaminants difficult. Groundwater samples were not collected because wastes are not disposed of on-site. Wastes are either transported off-site or discharged to the county sewer system (Ref. 2).

Following collection all samples were placed in specific containers, labeled, bagged and placed on ice. Samples were then transported to the Georgia-EPD Laboratory via state vehicle.

Chemical analyses by Georgia-EPD'slaboratory indicated the presence of barium, chromium, lead, copper, nickel and zinc in both on-site and background soil samples (see summary table). However, concentrations were not significantly different. Volatile organic compounds were not detected in either soil sample (Ref. 11, Appendix D).

All sample collection and lab analyses were conducted in accordance with quality assurance procedures established by EPA (Ref. 12).

SUMMARY - LABORATORY ANALYSIS

TOTAL METALS	SAMPLES	
MG/KG	S-1 (Soil Composite)	S-2 (Soil Background)
Silver	<2 mg/kg	<6 mg/kg
Arsenic	<4	<20
Barium	47	66
Cadmium	<1	<2
Chromium	16	81
Lead	16	17
Selenium	<5	<40
Cooper	12	32
Nickel	5	28
Zinc	59	32

5.0 SUMMARY

Laboratory analyses of samples collected at Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. determined that on-site soils are void of volatile organic contamination. Both soil samples contained barium, chromium, lead, copper, and nickel. However, slightly higher concentrations were found in the soil background sample. The on-site soil composite was found to have a higher concentration of zinc than the background sample.

There is no observed affect on surface waters downslope from the facility, as determined from records of the Clayton County Water Authority. The site is not easily accessible.

A total of 39 wells were observed within a four-mile radius of the site. Targets that may be potentially affected within a three-mile radius included 22 wells, serving a population of 84 people. However, it is not known whether these wells are currently being used.

Since observed releases cannot be documented and the preliminary HRS score is less than 25.0, Georgia EPD recommends no further remedial action be planned for the Chemical Leaman Tank Lines site.

REFERENCES

1. Walker, Steve, 1985. Preliminary Assessment - Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. (6-25-88). Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division.

2. Knowles, Gilda A., 1988. Trip Report - Site Reconnaissance Inspection of Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. (4-20-88). Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division.

3. Record of Telephonic Conversation, 4-21-88. Between Mr. Roscoe Mason, Terminal Manager for Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. and Gilda A. Knowles, Site Assessment Unit.

4. Knowles, Gilda A., 1988. Trip Report - Site Sampling Inspection of Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. (5-17-88). Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division.

5. U.S.G.S., 1965, 1954. Fayetteville Georgia (1965, photorevised 1982), Hampton, Georgia (1965, photorevised 1982), Riverdale, Georgia (1954, photorevised 1982) and Jonesboro, Georgia (1954, photorevised 1983). Quadrangle Map 7.5 Minute Series. Contour Interval 10 feet (Well Survey Map).

6. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, 1979. Soil Survey of Clayton, Fayette and Henry Counties, Georgia.

7. National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan, Appendix A. 40 CFR, Part 300, 47 Federal Register 31219

8. Record of Telephonic Conversation 4-18-88. Between Mr. Gilben Peoples, Water Quality Director and Gilda A. Knowles, Site Assessment Unit.

9. Record of Telephonic Conversation, 4-18-88. Between R.J. Scarbrough, Water Superintendent and Gilda A. Knowles, Site Assessment Unit.

10. Clark, J.S., S.A. Longworth, C.N. Joiner, M.F. Peck, K.W. McFadden, and B.J. Milby, 1986. Groundwater Data for Georgia. Open File Report 87-376. Prepared in cooperation with Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Geologic Survey.

11. Environmental Protection Division, 6-9-88. Laboratory Analysis Report. Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.; Jonesboro, Georgia. Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

APPENDIX A

OVERSIZED

DOCUMENT

APPENDIX B

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 1 - SITE LOCATION AND INSPECTION INFORMATION

I. IDENTIFICATION

01 STATE	02 SITE NUMBER
GA	D0468937764

II. SITE NAME AND LOCATION

01 SITE NAME (Legal, common, or descriptive name of site)	02 STREET, ROUTE NO., OR SPECIFIC LOCATION IDENTIFIER					
Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.	1251 Battle Creek Road					
03 CITY	**04 STATE**	**05 ZIP CODE**	**06 COUNTY**	**07 COUNTY CODE**	**08 CONG DIST**
Jonesboro	Ga.	30236	Clayton	063	N/A

09 COORDINATES: LATITUDE 33° 33' 00" | LONGITUDE 084° 21' 23.0"

10 TYPE OF OWNERSHIP (Check one)
☒ A. PRIVATE ☐ B. FEDERAL _____ ☐ C. STATE ☐ D. COUNTY ☐ E. MUNICIPAL
☐ F. OTHER _____ ☐ G. UNKNOWN

III. INSPECTION INFORMATION

01 DATE OF INSPECTION: 5 17 88 (MONTH DAY YEAR)

02 SITE STATUS: ☒ ACTIVE ☐ INACTIVE

03 YEARS OF OPERATION: 1971 (BEGINNING YEAR) Present (ENDING YEAR) ___ UNKNOWN

04 AGENCY PERFORMING INSPECTION (Check all that apply)
☐ A. EPA ☐ B. EPA CONTRACTOR _____ (Name of firm) ☐ C. MUNICIPAL ☐ D. MUNICIPAL CONTRACTOR _____ (Name of firm)
☒ E. STATE ☐ F. STATE CONTRACTOR _____ (Name of firm) ☐ G. OTHER _____ (Specify)

05 CHIEF INSPECTOR	06 TITLE	07 ORGANIZATION	08 TELEPHONE NO.
Gilda A. Knowles	Environmental Specialist	Site Assessment Unit	404 656-7404
09 OTHER INSPECTORS	**10 TITLE**	**11 ORGANIZATION**	**12 TELEPHONE NO.**
Randy Dominy	Environmental Specialist	Site Assessment Unit	(404) 656-7404
			( )
			( )
			( )
			( )

13 SITE REPRESENTATIVES INTERVIEWED	14 TITLE	15 ADDRESS	16 TELEPHONE NO.
Mr. Roscoe Mason	Terminal Manager	Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. P.O. Box 7 Jonesboro, Ga. 30236	(404) 471-4430
			( )
			( )
			( )
			( )
			( )

17 ACCESS GAINED BY (Check one)	18 TIME OF INSPECTION	19 WEATHER CONDITIONS
☒ PERMISSION ☐ WARRANT	8:00 AM	Clear, Sunny

IV. INFORMATION AVAILABLE FROM

01 CONTACT	02 OF (Agency/Organization)	03 TELEPHONE NO.
Mr. Roscoe Mason	Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.	(404) 471-4430

04 PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR SITE INSPECTION FORM	05 AGENCY	06 ORGANIZATION	07 TELEPHONE NO.	08 DATE
Gilda A. Knowles	DNR	EPD-SAU	(404) 656-7404	6 24 88 (MONTH DAY YEAR)

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 2 - WASTE INFORMATION

I. IDENTIFICATION

01 STATE	02 SITE NUMBER
GA	D046893764

II. WASTE STATES, QUANTITIES, AND CHARACTERISTICS

01 PHYSICAL STATES (Check all that apply)

- [x] A SOLID
- [ ] B POWDER, FINES
- [ ] C SLUDGE
- [ ] D OTHER _____ (Specify)
- [ ] E SLURRY
- [ ] F LIQUID
- [ ] G. GAS

02 WASTE QUANTITY AT SITE (Measures of waste quantities must be independent)

TONS _____

CUBIC YARDS _____

NO. OF DRUMS Unknown

03 WASTE CHARACTERISTICS (Check all that apply)

- [x] A TOXIC
- [ ] B. CORROSIVE
- [ ] C RADIOACTIVE
- [ ] D PERSISTENT
- [ ] E. SOLUBLE
- [x] F INFECTIOUS
- [x] G. FLAMMABLE
- [ ] H. IGNITABLE
- [ ] I HIGHLY VOLATILE
- [ ] J EXPLOSIVE
- [ ] K. REACTIVE
- [ ] L. INCOMPATIBLE
- [ ] M NOT APPLICABLE

III. WASTE TYPE

CATEGORY	SUBSTANCE NAME	01 GROSS AMOUNT	02 UNIT OF MEASURE	03 COMMENTS
SLU	SLUDGE			
OLW	OILY WASTE			
SOL	SOLVENTS	Unknown	Unknown	———
PSD	PESTICIDES			
OCC	OTHER ORGANIC CHEMICALS			
IOC	INORGANIC CHEMICALS			
ACD	ACIDS			
BAS	BASES			
MES	HEAVY METALS	Unknown	Unknown	———

IV. HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES (See Appendix for most frequently cited CAS Numbers)

01 CATEGORY	02 SUBSTANCE NAME	03 CAS NUMBER	04 STORAGE/DISPOSAL METHOD	05 CONCENTRATION	06 MEASURE OF CONCENTRATION
MES	Barium	7440-39-3	Substances are	47-66	mg/kg
	Chromium	7440-47-3	drummed and	16-81	mg/kg
	Lead	7439-92-1	shipped off-site	16-17	"
	Copper	7440-50-8	or discharged	12-32	"
	Nickel	7440-02-0	to sewer system	5-28	"
	Zinc	7440-66-6		59-32	"
	Above substances were found in soil composite and soil background samples				

V. FEEDSTOCKS (See Appendix for CAS Numbers)

CATEGORY	01 FEEDSTOCK NAME	02 CAS NUMBER	CATEGORY	01 FEEDSTOCK NAME	02 CAS NUMBER
FDS			FDS		
FDS			FDS		
FDS			FDS		
FDS			FDS		

VI. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (Cite specific references, e.g., state files, sample analysis, reports)

Georgia-EPD State Files; Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. Jonesboro, Ga. GAD046893764

EPA FORM 2070-13(7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 3 - DESCRIPTION OF HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS

I. IDENTIFICATION

01 STATE	02 SITE NUMBER
GA	D046893764

II. HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS

01 _ A. GROUNDWATER CONTAMINATION
02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
03 POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: _____
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ B. SURFACE WATER CONTAMINATION
02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
03 POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: _____
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ C. CONTAMINATION OF AIR
02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
03 POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: _____
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ D. FIRE/EXPLOSIVE CONDITIONS
02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
03 POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: _____
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ E. DIRECT CONTACT
02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
03 POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: _____
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ F. CONTAMINATION OF SOIL
02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
03 AREA POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: _____ (Acres)
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ G. DRINKING WATER CONTAMINATION
02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
03 POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: _____
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ H. WORKER EXPOSURE/INJURY
02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
03 WORKERS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: _____
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ I. POPULATION EXPOSURE/INJURY
02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
03 POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: _____
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 3 - DESCRIPTION OF HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS

I. IDENTIFICATION
01 STATE: GA | 02 SITE NUMBER: GAD046893764

II. HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS (Continued)

01 ☐ J. DAMAGE TO FLORA — 02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ K. DAMAGE TO FAUNA — 02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION (Include name(s) of species)

N/A

01 ☐ L. CONTAMINATION OF FOOD CHAIN — 02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ M. UNSTABLE CONTAINMENT OF WASTES (Spills Runoff Standing liquids, Leaking drums) — 02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
03 POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: _____ 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ N. DAMAGE TO OFFSITE PROPERTY — 02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ O. CONTAMINATION OF SEWERS, STORM DRAINS, WWTPs — 02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

01 ☐ P. ILLEGAL/UNAUTHORIZED DUMPING — 02 ☐ OBSERVED (DATE: _____) ☐ POTENTIAL ☐ ALLEGED
04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

N/A

05 DESCRIPTION OF ANY OTHER KNOWN, POTENTIAL, OR ALLEGED HAZARDS

N/A

III. TOTAL POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: 1 mi = 1,780 2mi = 4,225 3mi = 7,687 4mi = 12,186

IV. COMMENTS

None

V. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (Cite specific references, e.g., state files, sample analysis, reports)

Georgia - EPD State Files, Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.
Jonesboro, Ga.
GAD046893764

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION
PART 4 - PERMIT AND DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

I. IDENTIFICATION

01 STATE	02 SITE NUMBER
GA	D046893764

II. PERMIT INFORMATION

01 TYPE OF PERMIT ISSUED (Check all that apply)	02 PERMIT NUMBER	03 DATE ISSUED	04 EXPIRATION DATE	05 COMMENTS
☐ A. NPDES				
☐ B. UIC				
☐ C. AIR				
☐ D. RCRA				
☐ E. RCRA INTERIM STATUS				
☐ F. SPCC PLAN				
☐ G. STATE (Specify)				
☐ H. LOCAL (Specify)				
☐ I. OTHER (Specify)				
☑ J. NONE				

III. SITE DESCRIPTION

01 STORAGE/DISPOSAL (Check all that apply)	02 AMOUNT	03 UNIT OF MEASURE
☐ A. SURFACE IMPOUNDMENT		
☐ B. PILES		
☐ C. DRUMS, ABOVE GROUND		
☐ D. TANK, ABOVE GROUND		
☐ E. TANK, BELOW GROUND		
☐ F. LANDFILL		
☐ G. LANDFARM		
☐ H. OPEN DUMP		
☑ I. OTHER (Specify) INGROUND CONCRETE BASINS	UNKNOWN	(200-300 GAL CAPACITY)

04 TREATMENT (Check all that apply)

- ☐ A. INCENERATION
- ☐ B. UNDERGROUND INJECTION
- ☐ C. CHEMICAL/PHYSICAL
- ☐ D. BIOLOGICAL
- ☐ E. WASTE OIL PROCESSING
- ☐ F. SOLVENT RECOVERY
- ☐ G. OTHER RECYCLING/RECOVERY
- ☐ H. OTHER (Specify) N/A

05 OTHER

☑ A. BUILDINGS ON SITE: 2.0

06 AREA OF SITE

7.4 (Acres)

07 COMMENTS

N/A

IV. CONTAINMENT

01 CONTAINMENT OF WASTES (Check one)

☐ A. ADEQUATE, SECURE ☑ B. MODERATE ☐ C. INADEQUATE, POOR ☐ D. INSECURE, UNSOUND, DANGEROUS

02 DESCRIPTION OF DRUMS, DIKING, LINERS, BARRIERS, ETC.

The facility is surrounded by an eight-foot fence. The rear of the facility is bordered by Jester Creek and heavily forested areas.

V. ACCESSIBILITY

01 WASTE EASILY ACCESSIBLE: ☐ YES ☑ NO

02 COMMENTS

VI. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (Cite specific references, e.g. state files, sample analysis, reports)

Georgia - EPD State Files; Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. Jonesboro, Ga. GAD046893764

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 5 - WATER, DEMOGRAPHIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

I. IDENTIFICATION
01 STATE: GA | 02 SITE NUMBER: D04689364

II. DRINKING WATER SUPPLY

01 TYPE OF DRINKING SUPPLY (Check as applicable)

	SURFACE	WELL
COMMUNITY	A. ☒	B. ☒
NON-COMMUNITY	C. ☐	D. ☐

02 STATUS

	ENDANGERED	AFFECTED	MONITORED
	N/A		
A.	☐	B. ☐	C. ☐
D.	☐	E. ☐	F. ☐

03 DISTANCE TO SITE
A. >3.0 (mi)
B. _____ (mi)

III. GROUNDWATER

01 GROUNDWATER USE IN VICINITY (Check one)

☐ A. ONLY SOURCE FOR DRINKING ☒ B. DRINKING (Other sources available) COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL, IRRIGATION (No other water sources available) ☐ C. COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL, IRRIGATION (Limited other sources available) ☐ D. NOT USED, UNUSEABLE

02 POPULATION SERVED BY GROUND WATER: Unknown

03 DISTANCE TO NEAREST DRINKING WATER WELL: <1.0 (mi)

04 DEPTH TO GROUNDWATER	05 DIRECTION OF GROUNDWATER FLOW	06 DEPTH TO AQUIFER OF CONCERN	07 POTENTIAL YIELD OF AQUIFER	08 SOLE SOURCE AQUIFER
<100 (ft)	Unknown	<100 (ft)	Unknown (gpd)	☐ YES ☒ NO

09 DESCRIPTION OF WELLS (Including useage, depth, and location relative to population and buildings)
Wells in the area range from less than 100 to 400 feet. The city of Jonesboro's other source of drinking is their well system. One well is 290 ft deep and the second well is 400 feet deep

10 RECHARGE AREA		11 DISCHARGE AREA	
☒ YES ☐ NO	COMMENTS [redacted]	☐ YES ☐ NO	COMMENTS Unknown

IV. SURFACE WATER

01 SURFACE WATER USE (Check one)

☒ A. RESERVOIR, RECREATION DRINKING WATER SOURCE ☐ B. IRRIGATION, ECONOMICALLY IMPORTANT RESOURCES ☐ C. COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL ☐ D. NOT CURRENTLY USED

02 AFFECTED/POTENTIALLY AFFECTED BODIES OF WATER

NAME:	AFFECTED	DISTANCE TO SITE
Jester Creek empties into the Flint River downstream	☐	<1,500 ft. (mi)
	☐	(mi)

V. DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROPERTY INFORMATION

01 TOTAL POPULATION WITHIN

ONE (1) MILE OF SITE	TWO (2) MILES OF SITE	THREE (3) MILES OF SITE
A. 1,780 NO. OF PERSONS	B. 4,225 NO. OF PERSONS	C. 7,687 NO. OF PERSONS

02 DISTANCE TO NEAREST POPULATION: <600 ft.

03 NUMBER OF BUILDINGS WITHIN TWO (2) MILES OF SITE: >1,000

04 DISTANCE TO NEAREST OFF-SITE BUILDING: <600 ft.

05 POPULATION WITHIN VICINITY OF SITE (Provide narrative description of nature of population within vicinity of site, e.g., rural, village, densely populated urban area)
The facility is located in a heavily populated and industrialized area of Clayton County.

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 5 - WATER, DEMOGRAPHIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

I. IDENTIFICATION
01 STATE: GA | 02 SITE NUMBER: D046893764

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

01 PERMEABILITY OF UNSATURATED ZONE (Check one)

☐ A. 10^{-6} – 10^{-8} cm/sec ☒ B. 10^{-4} – 10^{-6} cm/sec ☐ C. 10^{-4} – 10^{-3} cm/sec ☐ D. GREATER THAN 10^{-3} cm/sec

02 PERMEABILITY OF BEDROCK (Check one)

☐ A. IMPERMEABLE (Less than 10^{-6} cm sec) ☐ B. RELATIVELY IMPERMEABLE (10^{-4} – 10^{-6} cm sec) ☒ C. RELATIVELY PERMEABLE (10^{-2} – 10^{-4} cm sec) ☐ D. VERY PERMEABLE (Greater than 10^{-2} cm sec)

03 DEPTH TO BEDROCK	04 DEPTH OF CONTAMINATED SOIL ZONE	05 SOIL pH
30.0 (ft)	There are no waste disposed of on-site. N/A (ft)	Unknown

06 NET PRECIPITATION	07 ONE YEAR 24 HOUR RAINFALL	08 SLOPE: SITE SLOPE	DIRECTION OF SITE SLOPE	TERRAIN AVERAGE SLOPE
6.0 (in)	3.0 (in)	4.16 %	West	4-6.0 %

09 FLOOD POTENTIAL: Unknown
SITE IS IN _____ YEAR FLOODPLAIN

10 ☐ SITE IS ON BARRIER ISLAND, COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA, RIVERINE FLOODWAY
N/A

11 DISTANCE TO WETLANDS (5 acre minimum)

ESTUARINE	OTHER
A. ——— (mi)	B. 1.25 (mi)

12 DISTANCE TO CRITICAL HABITAT (of endangered species)
There are no critical habitats of an endangered species in Clayton County
ENDANGERED SPECIES: N/A

13 LAND USE IN VICINITY

DISTANCE TO:

COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL	RESIDENTIAL AREAS; NATIONAL/STATE PARKS, FORESTS, OR WILDLIFE RESERVES	AGRICULTURAL LANDS: PRIME AG LAND	AG LAND
A. < 600 ft	B. 0.50 (mi)	C. ——— (mi)	D. >3.0 (mi)

14 DESCRIPTION OF SITE IN RELATION TO SURROUNDING TOPOGRAPHY

The facility is not surrounded by areas of higher elevation. The surrounding area is industrialized and heavily populated.

VII. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (Cite specific references, e.g., state files, sample analysis, reports)

Georgia-EPD State Files; Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. Jonesboro, Georgia GAD046893764

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 6 - SAMPLE AND FIELD INFORMATION

I. IDENTIFICATION

01 STATE	02 SITE NUMBER
GA	D046893764

II. SAMPLES TAKEN

SAMPLE TYPE	01 NUMBER OF SAMPLES TAKEN	02 SAMPLES SENT TO	03 ESTIMATED DATE RESULTS AVAILABLE
GROUNDWATER			
SURFACE WATER			
WASTE			
AIR			
RUNOFF			
SPILL			
SOIL	2	Georgia - EPD laboratory	6-9-88
VEGETATION			
OTHER			

III. FIELD MEASUREMENTS TAKEN

01 TYPE	02 COMMENTS
N/A	

IV. PHOTOGRAPHS AND MAPS

01 TYPE ☐ GROUND ☐ AERIAL N/A

02 IN CUSTODY OF _____ (Name of organization or individual)

03 MAPS ☑ YES ☐ NO

04 LOCATION OF MAPS Georgia - EPD State Files

V. OTHER FIELD DATA COLLECTED (Provide narrative description)

N/A

VI. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (Cite specific references, e.g., state files, sample analysis, reports)

Georgia - EPD State Files; Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc., Jonesboro, Ga. GAD046893764

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 7 - OWNER INFORMATION

I. IDENTIFICATION
01 STATE: GA | 02 SITE NUMBER: GAD046893764

II. CURRENT OWNER(S)

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER	03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE	05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE
Chemical Leaman Tank Lines		P.O. Box 200		Lionville	PA	19353

PARENT COMPANY (if applicable)

08 NAME	09 D+B NUMBER	10 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	11 SIC CODE	12 CITY	13 STATE	14 ZIP CODE

III. PREVIOUS OWNER(S) (List most recent first)

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER	03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE	05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE
N/A						

IV. REALTY OWNER(S) (If applicable, list most recent first)

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER	03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE	05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE
N/A						

V. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (Cite specific references, e.g., state files, sample analysis, reports)

Georgia EPD State Files; Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.
Jonesboro, Ga.
GAD046893764

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 8 - OPERATOR INFORMATION

I. IDENTIFICATION
01 STATE: GA | 02 SITE NUMBER: GAD046893764

II. CURRENT OPERATOR (Provide if different from owner)

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER
Chemical Leaman Tank Lines	

03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE
1251 Battle Creek Road	

05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE
Jonesboro	Ga.	30236

08 YEARS OF OPERATION	09 NAME OF OWNER
17	Same As Current Owners

OPERATOR'S PARENT COMPANY (If applicable)

10 NAME	11 D+B NUMBER
N/A	

12 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	13 SIC CODE

14 CITY	15 STATE	16 ZIP CODE

III. PREVIOUS OPERATOR(S) (List most recent first; provide only if different from owner)

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER
Unknown	

03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE

05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE

08 YEARS OF OPERATION	09 NAME OF OWNER DURING THIS PERIOD

PREVIOUS OPERATORS' PARENT COMPANIES (If applicable)

10 NAME	11 D+B NUMBER
N/A	

12 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	13 SIC CODE

14 CITY	15 STATE	16 ZIP CODE

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER

03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE

05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE

08 YEARS OF OPERATION	09 NAME OF OWNER DURING THIS PERIOD

10 NAME	11 D+B NUMBER

12 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	13 SIC CODE

14 CITY	15 STATE	16 ZIP CODE

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER

03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE

05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE

08 YEARS OF OPERATION	09 NAME OF OWNER DURING THIS PERIOD

10 NAME	11 D+B NUMBER

12 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	13 SIC CODE

14 CITY	15 STATE	16 ZIP CODE

IV. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (Cite specific references, e.g., state files, sample analysis, reports)

Georgia-EPD State Files; Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.
Jonesboro, Ga.
GAD046893764

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 9 - GENERATOR/TRANSPORTER INFORMATION

I. IDENTIFICATION

01 STATE	02 SITE NUMBER
GA	D046893764

II. ON-SITE GENERATOR

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER
N/A	

03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE

05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE

III. OFF-SITE GENERATOR(S)

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER	01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER
N/A			

03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE	03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE

05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE	05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER	01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER

03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE	03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE

05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE	05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE

IV. TRANSPORTER(S)

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER	01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER
N/A			

03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE	03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE

05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE	05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE

01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER	01 NAME	02 D+B NUMBER

03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE	03 STREET ADDRESS (P.O. Box, RFD #, etc.)	04 SIC CODE

05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE	05 CITY	06 STATE	07 ZIP CODE

V. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (Cite specific references, e.g., state files, sample analysis, reports)

Georgia-EPD State Files; Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. Jonesboro, Ga. GAD046893764

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 10 - PAST RESPONSE ACTIVITIES

I. IDENTIFICATION
01 STATE: GA | 02 SITE NUMBER: GAD046893764

II. PAST RESPONSE ACTIVITIES

01 ☐ A. WATER SUPPLY CLOSED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION
N/A

01 ☐ B. TEMPORARY WATER SUPPLY PROVIDED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ C. PERMANENT WATER SUPPLY PROVIDED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ D. SPILLED MATERIAL REMOVED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ E. CONTAMINATED SOIL REMOVED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ F. WASTE REPACKAGED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ G. WASTE DISPOSED ELSEWHERE — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ H. ON SITE BURIAL — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ I. IN SITU CHEMICAL TREATMENT — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ J. IN SITU BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ K. IN SITU PHYSICAL TREATMENT — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ L. ENCAPSULATION — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ M. EMERGENCY WASTE TREATMENT — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ N. CUTOFF WALLS — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ O. EMERGENCY DIKING/SURFACE WATER DIVERSION — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ P. CUTOFF TRENCHES/SUMP — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ Q. SUBSURFACE CUTOFF WALL — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 10 - PAST RESPONSE ACTIVITIES

I. IDENTIFICATION
01 STATE | 02 SITE NUMBER
GA D046893764

II PAST RESPONSE ACTIVITIES (Continued)

01 ☐ R. BARRIER WALLS CONSTRUCTED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION
N/A

01 ☐ S. CAPPING/COVERING — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ T. BULK TANKAGE REPAIRED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ U. GROUT CURTAIN CONSTRUCTED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ V. BOTTOM SEALED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ W. GAS CONTROL — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ X. FIRE CONTROL — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ Y. LEACHATE TREATMENT — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ Z. AREA EVACUATED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ 1. ACCESS TO SITE RESTRICTED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ 2. POPULATION RELOCATED — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

01 ☐ 3. OTHER REMEDIAL ACTIVITIES — 02 DATE _____ — 03 AGENCY _____
04 DESCRIPTION

III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (Cite specific references, e.g., state files, sample analysis, reports)

Georgia-EPD State Files, Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.
Jonesboro, Ga.
GAD046893764

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

EPA

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE
SITE INSPECTION REPORT
PART 11 - ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION

I. IDENTIFICATION

01 STATE	02 SITE NUMBER
GA	GAD046893764

II. ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION

01 PAST REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT ACTION ☐ YES ☒ NO

02 DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL REGULATORY/ENFORCEMENT ACTION

N/A

III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION *(Cite specific references, e.g., state files, sample analysis, reports)*

Georgia-EPD State Files; Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.
Jonesboro, Ga.
GAD046893764

EPA FORM 2070-13 (7-81)

APPENDIX C

HRS RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Laboratory analyses of samples collected at Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, inc. determined that on-site soils are void of volatile organic contamination. Both soil samples contained barium, chromium, lead, copper, and nickel. However, slightly higher concentrations were found in the soil background sample. The on-site soil composite was found to have a higher concentration of zinc than the background sample.

There is no observed affect on surface waters downslope from the facility, as determined from records of the Clayton County Water Authority. The site is not easily accessible.

A total of 39 wells were observed within a four-mile radius of the site. Targets that may be potentially affected within a three-mile radius included 22 wells, serving a population of 84 people. However, it is not known whether these wells are currently being used.

Since observed releases cannot be documented and the preliminary HRS score is 4.08, Georgia EPD recommends no further remedial action be planned for the Chemical Leaman Tank Lines site.

RCRA STATUS PAGE

Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. is classified as a small quantity generator.

Facility name: Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.

Location: 1251 Battle Creek Road; Jonesboro, Georgia 30236

EPA Region: IV

Person(s) in charge of the facility: Mr. Roscoe Mason, Terminal Manager
Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.
1251 Battle Creek Road
P.O. Box 7
Jonesboro, Georgia 30236

Name of Reviewer: Gilda A. Knowles Date: June 27, 1988

General description of the facility:

(For example: landfill, surface impoundment, pile, container; types of hazardous substances; location of the facility; contamination route of major concern; types of information needed for rating; agency action, etc.)

The facility transports chemical commodities in bulk quantities. Chemical Leaman Tank Lines began its operations in 1971. Tanker trucks which sometime transport hazardous chemicals are rinsed-out with a caustic solution and hot water. The final rinsate is discharged into a cascading system of six concrete basins. The wastewater is discharged to the sewer. The bottom sludge is handled by Barton Environmental Services of Morrow, Georgia.

Scores: $S_M = 4.08$ ($S_{gw} = 6.36$ $S_{sw} = 2.65$ $S_a =$ NOT SCORED)

S_{FE} = NOT SCORED

$S_{DC} = 0.00$.

FIGURE 1
HRS COVER SHEET

Ground Water Route Work Sheet

Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)
[1] Observed Release	(0) 45	1	0	45	3.1
If observed release is given a score of 45, proceed to line [4]. If observed release is given a score of 0, proceed to line [2].					
[2] Route Characteristics					3.2
76 to 150 ft — Depth to Aquifer of Concern	0 (1) 2 3	2	2	6	
6.0 inches — Net Precipitation	0 1 (2) 3	1	2	3	
sandy loam — Permeability of the Unsaturated Zone	0 1 (2) 3	1	2	3	
Liquid — Physical State	0 1 2 (3)	1	3	3	
Total Route Characteristics Score			9	15	
[3] Containment — Containers sealed and in sound condition	0 (1) 2 3	1	1	3	3.3
[4] Waste Characteristics					3.4
Toxicity/Persistence — Lead, chromium, copper	0 3 6 9 12 15 (18)	1	18	18	
Hazardous Waste Quantity — Quantity unknown; assumed a value of 1	0 (1) 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1	1	8	
Total Waste Characteristics Score			19	26	
[5] Targets					3.5
Drinking water with alternate source — Ground Water Use	0 1 (2) 3	3	6	9	
2,000 ft to 1.0 mile; 101-1,000 population — Distance to Nearest Well/Population Served	0 4 6 8 10 / 12 (16) 18 20 / 24 30 32 35 40	1	16	40	
Total Targets Score			22	49	
[6] If line [1] is 45, multiply [1] x [4] x [5]. If line [1] is 0, multiply [2] x [3] x [4] x [5]			3762	57,330	
[7] Divide line [6] by 57,330 and multiply by 100			S_{gw} = 6.56		

FIGURE 2
GROUND WATER ROUTE WORK SHEET

Surface Water Route Work Sheet

Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)
[1] Observed Release	(0) 45	1	0	45	4.1
If observed release is given a value of 45, proceed to line [4]. If observed release is given a value of 0, proceed to line [2].					
[2] Route Characteristics					4.2
3-5% — Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain	0 (1) 2 3	1	1	3	
3.0 inches — 1-yr. 24-hr. Rainfall	0 1 (2) 3	1	2	3	
1,000 feet to 1.0 mile — Distance to Nearest Surface Water	0 1 (2) 3	2	4	6	
Liquid — Physical State	0 1 2 (3)	1	3	3	
Total Route Characteristics Score			10	15	
[3] Containment	0 (1) 2 3	1	1	3	4.3
[4] Waste Characteristics					4.4
Toxicity/Persistence	0 3 6 9 12 15 (18)	1	18	18	
Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 (1) 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1	1	8	
Total Waste Characteristics Score			19	26	
[5] Targets					4.5
Drinking water — Surface Water Use	0 1 2 (3)	3	9	9	
>1.0 mile (1.25 miles) — Distance to a Sensitive Environment	(0) 1 2 3	2	0	6	
There are no known intakes within 3 miles (>3 miles) — Population Served/Distance to Water Intake Downstream	(0) 4 6 8 10 12 16 18 20 24 30 32 35 40	1	0	40	
Total Targets Score			9	55	
[6] If line [1] is 45, multiply [1] x [4] x [5]. If line [1] is 0, multiply [2] x [3] x [4] x [5]			1,710	64,350	
[7] Divide line [6] by 64,350 and multiply by 100			S_{sw} = 2.65		

Containers sealed and sound but not surrounded by strong diversion dyke

Lead, chromium, zinc, copper barium

Quantity unknown, assume value of 1

FIGURE 7
SURFACE WATER ROUTE WORK SHEET

Air Route Work Sheet NOT SCORED					
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)
[1] Observed Release	0 45	1		45	5.1
Date and Location:					
Sampling Protocol:					
If line [1] is 0, the S_a = 0. Enter on line [5]. If line [1] is 45, then proceed to line [2].					
[2] Waste Characteristics					5.2
Reactivity and Incompatibility	0 1 2 3	1		3	
Toxicity	0 1 2 3	3		9	
Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1		8	
	Total Waste Characteristics Score			20	
[3] Targets					5.3
Population Within 4-Mile Radius	0 9 12 15 18 21 24 27 30	1		30	
Distance to Sensitive Environment	0 1 2 3	2		6	
Land Use	0 1 2 3	1		3	
	Total Targets Score			39	
[4] Multiply [1] x [2] x [3]				35,100	
[5] Divide line [4] by 35,100 and multiply by 100		S_a =			

FIGURE 9
AIR ROUTE WORK SHEET

	S	S^2
Groundwater Route Score (S_{gw})	6.56	43.03
Surface Water Route Score (S_{sw})	2.65	7.02
Air Route Score (S_a)	NOT SCORED	—
$S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2$		50.05
$\sqrt{S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2}$		7.07
$\sqrt{S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2} / 1.73 = S_M =$		4.08

FIGURE 10
WORKSHEET FOR COMPUTING S_M

Fire and Explosion Work Sheet NOT SCORED						
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)			Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)
1 Containment	1	3		1		3	7.1
2 Waste Characteristics							7.2
Direct Evidence	0	3		1		3	
Ignitability	0 1 2	3		1		3	
Reactivity	0 1 2	3		1		3	
Incompatibility	0 1 2	3		1		3	
Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 1 2	3 4 5 6 7	8	1		8	
Total Waste Characteristics Score						20	
3 Targets							7.3
Distance to Nearest Population	0 1 2	3 4 5		1		5	
Distance to Nearest Building	0 1 2	3		1		3	
Distance to Sensitive Environment	0 1 2	3		1		3	
Land Use	0 1 2	3		1		3	
Population Within 2-Mile Radius	0 1 2	3 4 5		1		5	
Buildings Within 2-Mile Radius	0 1 2	3 4 5		1		5	
Total Targets Score						24	
4 Multiply 1 x 2 x 3						1,440	
5 Divide line 4 by 1,440 and multiply by 100				S_{FE} =			

FIGURE 11
FIRE AND EXPLOSION WORK SHEET

Fence and heavy forest area

Containers sound

Lead, Chromium

1,780

None in Clayton County

Direct Contact Work Sheet

Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi-plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)
1 Observed Incident	(0) 45	1	0	45	8.1
If line 1 is 45, proceed to line 4 If line 1 is 0, proceed to line 2					
2 Accessibility	(0) 1 2 3	1	0	3	8.2
3 Containment	(0) 15	1	0	15	8.3
4 Waste Characteristics Toxicity	0 1 2 (3)	5	15	15	8.4
5 Targets					8.5
Population Within a 1-Mile Radius	0 1 2 (3) 4 5	4	12	20	
Distance to a Critical Habitat	(0) 1 2 3	4	0	12	
Total Targets Score			12	32	
6 If line 1 is 45, multiply 1 x 4 x 5 If line 1 is 0, multiply 2 x 3 x 4 x 5			0.0	21,600	
7 Divide line 6 by 21,600 and multiply by 100			S_{DC} = 0.00		

FIGURE 12
DIRECT CONTACT WORK SHEET

DOCUMENTATION RECORDS
FOR
HAZARD RANKING SYSTEM

INSTRUCTIONS: As briefly as possible summarize the information you used to assign the score for each factor (e.g., "Waste quantity = 4,230 drums plus 800 cubic yards of sludges"). The source of information should be provided for each entry and should be a bibliographic-type reference. Include the location of the document.

FACILITY NAME: Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.

LOCATION: 1251 Battle Creek Road; P.O. Box 7; Jonesboro, Ga. 30236

DATE SCORED: June 27, 1988

PERSON SCORING: Gilda A. Knowles

PRIMARY SOURCE(S) OF INFORMATION (e.g., EPA region, state, FIT, etc.):

Georgia-EPD State Files, Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc.
Jonesboro, Georgia
GAD046893764

FACTORS NOT SCORED DUE TO INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION:

Air Route
Fire and Explosion

COMMENTS OR QUALIFICATIONS:

GROUND WATER ROUTE

1. **OBSERVED RELEASE** None.

Contaminants detected (5 maximum):

Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the facility:

2. **ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS**

Depth to Aquifer of Concern – Assigned Value = 1

Name/description of aquifer(s) of concern:

The aquifer of concern in the area is a crystalline rock aquifer., which is not laterally extensive. Ground-water storage occurs in unconsolidated material overlying the crystalline rock and in joints, fractures, and other types of secondary openings in rock. Depth of aquifer of concern 100-ft. (Ref. 1,2

Depth(s) from the ground surface to the highest seasonal level of the saturated zone [water table(s)] of the aquifer of concern:

The depth from the ground surface to the highest seasonal level of the saturated zone/water table in the area ranges from 9 to 24 feet.

(Ref. 3)

Depth from the ground surface to the lowest point of waste disposal/storage:

The depth from the ground surface to the lowest point of waste disposal is not applicable because wastes are not disposed of on-site. However, samples were collected from a depth of 2-6 inches (Ref. 4)

Net Precipitation - Assigned Value = 2

Mean Annual or seasonal precipitation (list months for seasonal):
The mean annual precipitation for the area is 48.0 inches. (Ref. 3).

Mean annual lake or seasonal evaporation (list months for seasonal):
The mean annual lake evaporation is 42.0 inches. (Ref. 5).

Net precipitation (subtract the above figures):
The net precipitation for the area is 6.0 inches. (Ref. 5).

Permeability of Unsaturated Zone - Assigned Value = 2

Soil type in unsaturated zone:
The soil type in the unsaturated zone is a Pocolat sandy loam, 6 to 10 % slopes. (Ref. 3)

Permeability associated with soil type:
The permeability associated with the aforementioned soil type is 10^{-3} - 10^{-5} cm/sec., which is the approximate range of hydraulic conductivity. (Ref. 5).

Physical State - Assigned Value = 3

Physical state of substances at time of disposal (or at present time for generated gases):
The physical state of substances at time of disposal was liquid (Ref. 6).

3. **CONTAINMENT**

Containment Assigned Value = 1

Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:

The method of waste containment evaluated is in sound condition

(Ref. 6)

Method with highest score:

Method with highest score is containers in sound condition

4. **WASTE CHARACTERISTICS**

Toxicity and Persistence - Assigned Matrix Value - 18

Compound(s) evaluated:

The compounds evaluated that were found in samples were lead, barium, chromium, copper.

(Ref. 7)

Compound with highest score:

The compounds with the highest score were all of the above.

Hazardous Waste Quantity Assigned Value = 1

Total quantity of hazardous substances at the facility, excluding those with a containment score of 0 (Give a reasonable estimate even if quantity is above maximum):

The total quantity of hazardous substances at the facility [redacted] is unknown

(Ref. 5)

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

N/A

5. **TARGETS**

Ground Water Use - Assigned Value = 2

Use(s) of aquifer(s) of concern within a 3-mile radius of the facility:

The use of the aquifer of concern within a 3-mile radius of the facility is drinking water with alternate source (Ref. 8)

Distance to the Nearest Well - Assigned Value = 3 Matrix Value = 16

Location of nearest well drawing from aquifer of concern or occupied building not served by a public water supply:

The location of the nearest well drawing from the aquifer of concern < 1.0 mile).

(Ref. 9),

Distance to above well or building:

The distance to the above is < 1.0 mile -

(Ref. 9).

Population Served by Ground Water Wells Within a 3-Mile Radius Assigned Value = 2 Matrix Value = 16

Identified water-supply well(s) drawing from aquifer(s) of concern within a 3-mile radius and populations served by each:

Population drawing from the aquifer of concern within 3-mile radius is 101 - 1,000 people

(Ref. 9)

Computation of land area irrigated by supply well(s) drawing from aquifer(s) of concern within a 3-mile radius, and conversion to population (1.5 people per acre):

(Ref. 8)

No lands are irrigated by supply wells.

Total population served by ground water within a 3-mile radius:

The total population served by groundwater within a 3-mile radius is 101 - 1,000 people

(Ref. 9

SURFACE WATER ROUTE

1. **OBSERVED RELEASE** None.

Contaminants detected in surface water at the facility or downhill from it (5 maximum):

Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the facility:

2. **ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS**

Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain

Average slope of facility in percent:
The average slope of the facility is 4.16 %. (Ref. 9)

Name/description of nearest downslope surface water:
The nearest downslope surface water is Jester Creek. (Ref. 9)

Average slope of terrain between facility and above-cited surface water body in percent:
The average slope of terrain between facility and the above-cited surface water body is 3-5 % (Ref. 3).

Is the facility located either totally or partially in surface water?
The facility is not located in surface water. (Ref. 9).

Is the facility completely surrounded by areas of higher elevation?

The facility is not completely surrounded by areas of higher elevation.

(Ref. 9)

1-Year 24-Hour Rainfall in Inches Assigned Value = 2

The 1-year 24-hour rainfall for the area is 3.0 inches.

(Ref. 5)

Distance to Nearest Downslope Surface Water – Assigned Value = 2

The distance to the nearest downslope surface water is 1,000 feet.

(Ref. 9)

Physical State of Waste Assigned Value = 3

The physical state of the waste is liquid

(Ref. 6)

6. **CONTAINMENT**

Containment Assigned Value = 1

Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:

The method of waste containment evaluated, containers sealed and sound, but not surrounded by strong diversion system

(Ref. 6, 5),

Method with highest score:

Method listed above.

4. **WASTE CHARACTERISTICS** Assigned Matrix

Toxicity and Persistence Value = 18

Compound(s) evaluated:

Compounds that were found in samples collected were lead, barium, copper, zinc, Chromium.

(Ref. 7).

Compound with highest score:

The compound with the highest score; all of the above

(Ref. 5).

Hazardous Waste Quantity Assigned Value = 1

Total quantity of hazardous substances at the facility, excluding those with a containment score of 0 (Give reasonable estimate even if quantity is above maximum):

The total quantity of hazardous substances at the facility is unknown

(Ref. 5)

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

(Ref. 5). If quantity is unknown, assume value of 1.

5. **TARGETS**

Surface Water Use Assigned Value = 3

Use(s) of surface water within 3 miles downstream of the hazardous substance:

The surface water use within 3-miles downstream from the hazardous substances is for drinking water. (Ref. 10) Intakes however are greater than 3-miles from the site.

Is there tidal influence?

There is no tidal influence at the site.

(Ref. 9)

Distance to a Sensitive Environment

Distance to 5-acre (minimum) coastal wetland, if 2 miles or less:

The distance to a 5-acre coastal wetland is greater than 2.0 miles.

(Ref. 9)

Distance to 5-acre (minimum) fresh-water wetland, if 1 mile or less:

The distance to a 5-acre fresh-water wetland is 1.25 miles.

(Ref. 9)

Distance to critical habitat of an endangered species or national wildlife refuge, if 1 mile or less:

There are no critical habitats of an endangered species in Clayton County

(Ref. 11)

Population Served by Surface Water

Location(s) of water-supply intake(s) within 3 miles (free-flowing bodies) or 1 mile (static water bodies) downstream of the hazardous substance and population served by each intake:

There are no intakes within a 3-mile radius (Ref. 10).

Computation of land area irrigated by above-cited intake(s) and conversion to population (1.5 people per acre):

N/A

Total population served:

N/A

Name/description of nearest of above water bodies:

N/A

Distance to above-cited intakes, measured in stream miles:

N/A

AIR ROUTE NOT SCORED

1. OBSERVED RELEASE

Contaminants detected:

Date and location of detection of contaminants:

Methods used to detect the contaminants:

Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the site:

2. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Reactivity and Incompatibility

Most reactive compound:

Most incompatible pair of compounds:

Toxicity

Most toxic compound:

Hazardous Waste Quantity

Total quantity of hazardous waste:

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

3. **TARGETS**

Population Within 4-Mile Radius

Circle radius used, give population, and indicate how determined:

0 to 4 mi. 0 to 1 mi. 0 to ½ mi. 0 to ¼ mi.

Distance to a Sensitive Environment

Distance to 5-acre (minimum) coastal wetland, if 2 miles or less:

Distance to 5-acre (minimum) fresh-water wetland, if 1 mile or less:

Distance to critical habitat of an endangered species, if 1 mile or less:

Land Use

Distance to commercial/industrial area, if 1 mile or less:

Distance to national or state park, forest, or wildlife reserve, if 2 miles or less:

Distance to residential area, if 2 miles or less:

Distance to agricultural land in production within past 5 years, if 1 mile or less:

Distance to prime agricultural land in production within past 5 years, if 2 miles or less:

Is a historic or landmark site (National Register or Historic Places and National Natural Landmarks) within the view of the site?